1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

12

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

FILED IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Jan 06, 2023

SEAN F. MCAVOY, CLERK

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

MICHAEL SCOTT BRUMBACK, an individual, and GIMME GUNS, a sole proprietorship,

Plaintiffs,

V.

ROBERT W. FERGUSON, in his official capacity as Washington State Attorney General; JOHN R. BATISTE, in his official capacity as Chief of the Washington State Patrol; ROBERT UDELL, in his official capacity as the Sheriff for Yakima County, Washington; and JOSEPH A. BRUSIC, in his official capacity as County Prosecutor for Yakima County,

Defendants,

ALLIANCE FOR GUN RESPONSIBILITY,

Defendant-Intervenor.

No. 1:22-cv-03093-MKD

ORDER GRANTING IN PART MOTION TO STRIKE AND GRANTING RELATED MOTION TO EXPEDITE

**ECF Nos. 42, 43** 

ORDER GRANTING IN PART MOTION TO STRIKE AND GRANTING RELATED MOTION TO EXPEDITE - 1

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

11

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

Before the Court is Defendants Robert W. Ferguson, John R. Batiste, ("the State Defendants") and Defendant-Intervenor Alliance for Gun Responsibility's Motion to Strike Plaintiffs' Notice of Supplemental Authority, ECF No. 42, and related Motion to Expedite, ECF No. 43. The Motion to Strike seeks to strike the attachments to Plaintiffs' Notice of Supplemental Authority, ECF No. 41, except for ECF No. 41-7. The Motion to Expedite seeks an expedited review of the Motion to Strike to ensure that the matter is considered in conjunction with the pending Motion for Preliminary Injunction, ECF No. 20.

Although Plaintiffs' filing is titled a "Notice of Supplemental Authority," the majority of the submission is not legal authority. ECF No. 41. The materials demonstrate that other litigation is ongoing, as are efforts to enforce RCW 9.41. With the exception of the state court order, the filings are not binding or persuasive authority. They are litigation documents including argument and expert reports. Reliance on such materials would be inappropriate as they are not properly before the Court for consideration and Defendants have not been afforded an opportunity to respond.

## Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED**:

1. The Motion to Expedite State Defendants' and Intervenor-Defendant's Motion to Strike Plaintiffs' Notice of Supplemental Authorities,

ORDER GRANTING IN PART MOTION TO STRIKE AND GRANTING **RELATED MOTION TO EXPEDITE - 2** 

| 1  | ECF No. 43, is <b>GRANTED.</b> The Motion to Strike Plaintiffs' Notice of |
|----|---|
| 2  | Supplemental Authority, ECF No. 42, is GRANTED in part.                   |
| 3  | 2. The record is modified as follows:                                     |
| 4  | a. ECF No. 41-2 is STRICKEN.  |
| 5  | b. ECF No. 41-3 is STRICKEN.  |
| 6  | c. ECF No. 41-4 is STRICKEN.  |
| 7  | d. ECF No. 41-5 is STRICKEN.  |
| 8  | e. ECF No. 41-6 is STRICKEN.  |
| 9  | f. ECF No. 41-8 is STRICKEN.  |
| 10 | g. ECF No. 41-9 is STRICKEN.  |
| 11 | h. ECF No. 41-10 is STRICKEN.   |
| 12 | i. ECF No. 41-11 is STRICKEN.   |
| 13 | IT IS SO ORDERED. The District Court Executive is directed to file this   |
| 14 | order and provide copies to the parties.                                  |
| 15 | DATED January 5, 2023.  |
| 16 | s/Mary K. Dimke   |
| 17 | MARY K. DIMKE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE                                |
| 18 | OMILD SIMILS DISTRICT JUDGE   |
| 19 |   |
| 20 |   |
|    |   |

ORDER GRANTING IN PART MOTION TO STRIKE AND GRANTING RELATED MOTION TO EXPEDITE - 3